

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COM United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION
10/050,783	01/18/2002	Bernd Ondruschka	00366.000158	9562
5514	7590 05/27/2004		EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			HWU, DAVIS D	
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3752	

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·	-111				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	(A A)				
Advisory Action	10/050,783	ONDRUSCHKA ET AL.					
·	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Davis Hwu	3752					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the (correspondence addres	s				
THE REPLY FILED 06 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apple Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper reply ich places the applicati	to a on in				
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ace event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dhave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extermining the period of extermining the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. Insign and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See I 136(a) and the appropriate extension of the final Office action; or (2) a	MPEP tension fee ion fee under as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF							
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:						
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furtle	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or sim	plifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.					
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed a	mendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		sidered but does NOT	place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims v			d an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	;						
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.					
. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
10. Other:	, ,						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The room in which the device of Polan is installed can be considered to be a chamber when the door and windows are closed and also fires are known to emit high frequency radaition depending on the intensity of the fire. Thus, the device of Polan and Evans et al. comprises the limitations of the rejected claims.